

REMARKS

The Office Action dated 11/03/2004 requires Applicant to elect one of two groups of claims, i.e., Groups I and II. Group I includes claims 1—14 and 16—17. Group II includes claim 15. The Applicant hereby elects Group I. However, this election is made with traverse for the following reasons.

M.P.E.P. § 803 states that an application may be properly restricted only if (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed, and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. Thus, even if appropriate reasons exist for requiring restriction, such a requirement should not be made unless there is an undue burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims in a single application.

It would seem that the searches involved for both claim groups would substantially overlap. For instance, while the Examiner states that Group I is directed to a method and system for a structured document, this is subject matter related to that recited in non-elected claim 15, which is directed to a method for printing such a document. Because documents and printing documents are closely related, serious burden on the Patent Office does not appear to be present.

Moreover, since Group II comprises only the single claim 15, the burden of processing both groups is not great.

For at least the above-identified reasons, the Applicant accordingly requests removal of the Restriction Requirement and examination of all of the claims, i.e., claims 1—17.

The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned if any issues remain unresolved by this Response.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 12-3-04

By: David S. Thompson

David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25